



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

rum dominos was in apposition with *deos*, "wie schon Ovid die Worte verstand: ex Ponto I 9, 36 terrarum dominos quam colis ipse deos". Surely, Ovid's phrase has no significance in relation to Horace's. That is a suggestive remark of Conington's (II, xlv); "Virgil imitated Homer, but imitated him as a rival, not as a disciple" (Cf. A. J. P. XXVI 336). Of this statement we may say, quod in una re positum transferri in permultas potest (De Off. I. 51). If we remember how fond the Roman poets were of using old materials in new combinations, we shall think twice before we say that a verbal resemblance in a later author is proof positive for a given interpretation of a passage in an earlier author.

But I must have done. Let my last word be this, that I shall be sorry if my criticisms of this monumental book shall lead any one to believe that I do not appreciate it as it deserves to be valued.

CHARLES KNAPP.

Attis; Seine Mythen und Sein Kult. Von HUGO HEPDING, Assistent a. d. Grossh. Universitäts-Bibliothek in Giessen. Pp. 224. Giessen, J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1903.

Dr. Hepding's work, which forms Volume I of Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten herausgegeben von Albrecht Dieterich in Heidelberg and Richard Wünsch in Giessen, is divided into an introduction and six chapters, as follows: Einleitung; I. Urkunden des Attiskults; II. Attismythen; III. Der Attiskult; IV. Mysterien und Taurobolien; V. Beinamen des Attis; VI. Zur Entwicklung der Attismythen und des Attiskults.

A brief indication of the contents of each chapter will serve to make the nature of the book intelligible. I. Urkunden des Attiskults (pp. 5-97): The literary (5-77) and epigraphical (78-97) sources. The former extend over a period from Herodotus (really from Theopompus, who is the first to use the actual name of Attis, or better, the Alexandrians, in whose writings occurs the first sure mention of the myth), to Gregory of Tours in Latin and Suidas and Eustathius in Greek, and are arranged chronologically without classification according to language. The latter are divided into Greek (78-85) and Latin (85-97) sources, the Greek covering a period from the Peiraic inscriptions of the second century B. C. (C. I. A. II 1, 622, 624; IV 2, 624 b) to an inscription of Cephissia dating 387 A. D. (C. I. A. III 1, 173), the Latin representing the reign of Domitian at one extreme (VI 10098) and the year 390 A. D. at the other (VI 503). The fact that only 34 of the 69 Greek and Latin inscriptions can be even approximately dated explains the author's choice of the linguistic rather than the chronological arrangement. Those which admit it, however, are chronologically tabulated on p. 97. There are no literary and epigraphical sources other than Greek and Latin.

II. Attismythen. A critical account of the myth as presented in the foregoing sources, with the conclusion that there are in the main two versions to be distinguished: one the Lydian, in which Attis is slain by a boar; the other the Phrygian, in which his death is the consequence of self-castration. The latter form of the myth became the more common because of the Phrygian provenance of the Roman Cybele-Attis cult. The wide variation in detail which is so characteristic of religious myth and so confusing in the study of ancient worship is explained (after W. Robertson Smith; *The Religion of the Semites*, 1894) as due to the fact that dogmatism did not exist among the ancients, orthodoxy meaning to them the exact performance of traditional rites rather than subscription to theory regarding their origin. The importance of myth in the study of religion may therefore easily be overestimated.

III. Der Attiskult. In Herod. IV 76, which contains the first mention of the Phrygian cult of the Great Mother, though the chief peculiarities of her worship are presented—orgiastic music, enthusiasm, the wearing of *ἀγάλματα* by the priests, the celebration of rites in a sacred grove—neither Attis nor the emasculated Galloi are mentioned, the inference being that the latter, at least, had not yet been communicated from the Semitic worship to that of the Phrygian Mother. The Alexandrian writers are our first positive evidence of the presence of both, though neither they nor later writers (comparatively little evidence is of earlier date than the Christian era) afford much direct information regarding the cult in its original home in Phrygia beyond the general facts that a festival took place each spring at which the death of Attis was commemorated by the lamentation of worshippers and the self-laceration of priests, and his resurrection by unrestrained rejoicing, the whole being concluded by the bathing of the idol of the Mother. In Greece the cult of Attis seems never to have become popular because of the peculiarities of its rites, which could hardly fail to be objectionable to a people who were noted for their contempt for foreign deities. At the Peiræus, the most important of the few places in Greece where Attis is known to have been worshiped, there is no evidence of the existence of Galloi. At Rome he was worshiped unofficially, so to speak, during the Republic, and with the sanction of the State only from the Emperor Claudius on, when his rites attained to great importance. Dr. Hepding devotes the greater portion of the chapter to the annual Roman festival of March 15-27, which in his opinion is practically identical with the native Phrygian celebration.

IV. *Mysterien und Taurobolien*. The Phrygian mysteries, like those of many primitive nations, were originally the rites of initiation through which all up-growing members of the race became full participants in the social, religious, and political life of the community. Their existence outside of Phrygia was the

result of the acceptance of aliens to membership by Phrygian communities which had settled among them. When Claudius made the full cult of the Great Mother and Attis a State institution, participation in its ordinary rites was thrown open to all *ipso facto*, though only such as specially desired it were initiated into the full mysteries, which were celebrated during the March festival. The circle of the fully initiated was thus smaller than that of the whole community of worshipers. Our knowledge of the mysteries is for the most part limited to the evidence of analogy. Confessing the instability of this, Dr. Hepding, by utilizing with great acumen the few scraps of available literary evidence, constructs the qualifications and initiatory ceremonies of the Cybele-Attis mystic. Beginning with the 15th of March, *Canna intrat*, sexual abstinence and fasting were prescribed, bread, pork, wine, fish, and root and grain foods being among forbidden articles of diet. Two degrees of fasting may have existed, the fuller degree beginning on March 22, *Arbor intrat*. Lustral purification probably accompanied the fasting. The whole period was preparatory to a sacrament occurring on the night of March 24, *Dies Sanguinis*, which seems to have been administered from the characteristic instruments of the cult, the tympanum and the cymbal, and which had the effect of admitting the novice to full communion with the divine objects of his adoration as well as with the brotherhood of mystic worshipers. After the sacrament the candidate carried in solemn procession the *κέρας*, which Dr. Hepding interprets as the sacred vessel in which were deposited, during their disposition according to ritual, the *vires* of newly consecrated priests. Following this, the mystic took part in the most solemn and trying ceremony of all. To the accompaniment of weird *θρήνοι*, he was conducted at dead of night into the inner grot of the goddess, where, having descended into the sacrificial foss, he received the baptism of blood in the taurobolium. Then, with the breaking of wondrous light and the lifting of cries of jubilation, he awoke from the mystic death *in aeternum renatus*. Honey and milk were given him, he received a crown, and was saluted by all. The *Hilaria*, March 25, began at the moment of his rebirth. The mystic enjoyed the expectation of a happy life of the soul after death.

V. Beinamen des Attis. Greek and Latin epithets of Attis to the number of sixty, with eight of the Mother and Attis together. By far the greater number of those which reflect the character of Attis date from the late Empire.

VI. Zur Entwicklung der Attismythen und des Attiskults. The Phrygians, an Aryan race invading Asia Minor from Thrace, blended their own goddess Kotys with the native Asiatic Mother-goddess Mâ, and their Dionysus-Sabazius with Attis-Papas, the native Asiatic male deity whom they found existing side by side with Mâ, the belief in immortality and the orgiastic worship which characterized the cult of Dionysus being grafted onto the cult of

the newly adopted deity of Asia. With the growth of Syrian power came intimate contact with the Semitic religions, resulting in the modification of the Phrygian cult, one especial change being the introduction of castration into the priesthood. In time, through the need of an *αἵτιον* to justify the cruel and revolting deed of the priests, grew up the legend of the self-castration of Attis. This, made popular by the Alexandrian writers, soon found place in the official cult-legends, and the character of Attis as a great and independent deity was gradually lost sight of. In the mysteries he became the symbol of immortality and the sharer of it with those who were united to him. Syncretism next made him a great solar deity. Finally, such was his character and such the body of doctrine underlying his mysteries that his worshipers could even compare him with Christ.

It will have been immediately noticed that Dr. Hepding's work as it stands takes no account of monumental evidence. From beginning to end the reader is consequently burdened with a sense of its incompleteness, and the keenness of his disappointment (which is a tribute to the genius of Cumont) is only partially assuaged by the author's promise to present the monuments in a separate instalment of the work. This Dr. Hepding is certainly bound to do, for, deprecate comparison though he may, he will be judged according to the measure in which he has availed himself of the model which Cumont in his *Mithras* has set before students of oriental religion. It will be regretted, we fear, both by Dr. Hepding and his readers, that his treatment of the literary and epigraphical evidence in the present volume was not deferred until the completion of his study of the monuments; for the clearness of vision which he confesses to have grown with his study of the former (*Diese wichtige Periode [the decline of Paganism] pflegt zunächst dem jungen Philologen ferner zu liegen, und auch mir entwickelte sich erst allmählich im Verlauf meiner Arbeit das Bild derselben in deutlicheren Farben* [p. 2]) will no doubt have so increased with a thorough study of the latter that the present work will in many respects imperfectly represent his knowledge.

But Dr. Hepding has nevertheless merited well of the students of ancient religion. Besides a convenient presentation of the literary and epigraphical sources, which is itself no slight service, his work presents an interpretation of them which is characterized by logical arrangement of the whole and soberness and sanity in the treatment of detail. It reflects credit both upon the author and upon his confessed guide and inspirer, Albrecht Dieterich, and one is almost surprised at the confession that the book is the first fruit of the author's studies.

A work like the one before us, aiming as it does to sum up present knowledge of a single subject necessarily partakes of the nature of a compilation whose content comprises the evidence of antiquity and the views of modern scholarship. Were it no

more than this, we should still be greatly in Dr. Hepding's debt; but besides clearly presenting modern interpretation of the ancient evidence, he frequently contributes by the expression of decided conclusions of his own. He holds (102) against Ellis (Catullus² p. 252) that the *μυστικὸς δὲ ὁ λόγος* of Harpocration refers merely to the *ῥῆς ἀττης ἀττης ῥῆς* of Demosthenes rather than to a book on Attis by Neanthes of Cyzicus . . . He supports (136 f.) Rohde against Foucart in interpreting the *κλίνη* and *θρόνοι* of C. I. A. II 1, 622, 624 as indicating the theoxenia rather than the mystery-drama of Attis and the Great Mother . . . He accepts Cumont's view (De Ruggiero, Diz. Epig. s. v. Attis) that Attis was worshiped with the Mother at Rome from the introduction of the cult in 204, but in an unofficial way by the Phrygian priests alone, against Rapp (Roschers Lex. s. v. Attis, 724; cf. Showerman, Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc. XXXI, 1900, pp. 46-59: Was Attis at Rome under the Republic?), basing his conclusion (142 ff.) on the coin of Cethegus, the existence of the *Lavatio* on the evidence of Ovid Fast. IV 337 ff. and Menolog. Rust., and the general improbability of the separation of the two deities. I still hold, however, that the representation on the coin is best interpreted as a general, not a specific, Phrygian allusion, because of the uncertainty as to the date, the striker, and the identity of the figure on it; that the universal silence of the easily scandalized Romans of the Republic is difficult to explain if we are to assume that Attis was worshiped in their midst even privately; and that the general improbability of his separation from the Mother is not sufficient to counterbalance this silence in authors like Lucretius and Cicero, who speak freely of the goddess herself, especially when due regard is had to the unimportance of Attis in Greece, where the worship of the Mother existed in some instances alone, and in Asia itself, where he is not heard of before the Alexandrian period. A glance at Dr. Hepding's assemblage of Beinamen shows that the employment of epithets which indicate the greatness of Attis dates from the late Empire. The Attis of pre-Roman times must not be invested with attributes for which the philosophy of a much later period is responsible. As to the *Lavatio*, Dr. Hepding's view that in Ovid's time it was celebrated on March 27, and that its presence during the Republic indicates the existence of the whole cycle of ceremonies in honor of both deities, though it alone was public, seems to me untenable. The *Lavatio* which Ovid mentions is the original ceremony of April 4, 204. If the poet means to explain a custom of his own time by giving its *αἴτιον*, it is certainly a custom of April 4, not of March 27. The whole passage (IV 179-372) indicates an official one-day celebration of the rites of the Great Mother of which the *Lavatio* formed a single feature. The *Megalesia* followed, beginning on the next day. That the *Lavatio* had not yet been set apart on a day of its own, but was still only one item in a whole day's program, accounts for its not being named in the official Calendar which

was Ovid's source. The *Lavatio* of Menolog. Rust., on the contrary, occurred on March 27, which indicates the expansion of the cult on the model of its Phrygian prototype, and consequently the presence of Attis. It is plain from Ovid that the Menolog. Rust. did not exist in his time, for the *Lavatio* of the poet is on April 4, and he makes no mention of a *Lavatio* in March, an omission which could not have occurred had these Calendars (which cannot be supposed to record unofficial festivals) been in existence. Their date must be placed as late as Claudius, under whom the cult was expanded (Cf. Huebner, *Exempla* 979: *litterae videntur saeculi primi circiter medii esse*). The omission in them of all other events of the annual festival is due to necessary brevity; they give the fewest possible data, and include the *Lavatio* rather than the *Hilaria* or other festivals of the cult because of its having through long existence become a naturalized celebration.... The nationalization of the full Phrygian cult under Claudius is accepted by Dr. Hepding (145) on the authority of Lydus *De Mens.* IV 59, against Wissowa (*Relig. u. Kult. der Römer* 266 f.) and Bloch (*Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1902, 722), and the question seems to be settled.... The reference of the self-laceration of the Galloi particularly to the *Dies Sanguinis* (159) rather than to general and undefined occasions is also maintained against Wissowa.... The identification by Becker, Henzen, and Mommsen of *hastiferi sive pastores* and *dendrophori* is disputed by Hepding (169 f.), who sees in *hastiferi* the Latinization of the αἰχμοφόροι mentioned by Herodian I 10 as taking part in a Roman procession in the time of Commodus, and in *pastores* the analogy of the βουκόλοι of the orgiastic cults of Asia Minor.... Finally, with what seems good reason, Dr. Hepding takes ground (170 f.) against Cumont's view that the *hastiferi* were connected with the cult of Bellona, and that the taurobolium found its way into the Mother's cult only after it had been introduced into Italy in the worship of Bellona, into which it had come through the kindred cult of Anahita or Artemis Tauropolos. Dr. Hepding is inclined to the view (201) that the sacrifice existed in the Asiatic cult of the Great Mother prior to her arrival in Rome.

To pass now from the author's judicial contributions, if his positive advancement of our knowledge is after all slight, it is rather because of inherent difficulties than from any lack of either industry or insight. His inclination (157) is to believe with Mommsen that the Tubilustrium, March 23, was in latter times a part of the March festival of the Mother; that a night celebration with torches, on the analogy of the Eleusinian mysteries, took place between *Dies Sanguinis* and *Hilaria*, concluding with jubilation at the announcement of the rise of Attis (165 ff.); and that (176) *Initium Caiani*, March 28, was a feature of the March festival—but the evidence presented is not conclusive.... His reconstruction of the process of initiation into the mysteries of the cult (ch. IV), which is the part of the work in which his vision is

keenest and his originality most noticeable, is after all, as the author himself confesses, only reconstruction grounded for the most part on analogy. That fasting and abstinence preceded a sacrament seems probable, but of the author's conclusions as to the time, manner, material, and effect of the sacred meal the best that can be said is that he has made them seem possible, though not in all cases probable. Especially regarding the reconstruction of the events of the night between *Dies Sanguinis* and *Hilaria*, with its torchlight procession, mystic feast, and blood baptism in the taurobolium does one feel sceptical. (In connection with the effect of the baptism it should be noted that C. I. L. 736, cited on p. 197, is false. Cf. Cumont II p. 179, no. 584, note.) Finally (ch. VI), Dr. Hepding's view that Attis existed in Asia Minor in pre-Phrygian times as a great male deity corresponding to the Great Mother, that subsequently the story of the self-castration of Attis was invented as an *αἵτιον* to account for the bloody rite which had fastened itself upon the Phrygian cult as a result of Semitic influence, and that in consequence of this he sank from his independent position to the level of the minor deity in a duality, will seem unnecessarily involved to those who see in Attis at most a comparatively late blending of Adonis with a Phrygian analogue.

In conclusion, let me barely mention a suspicion which has occurred to me regarding the significance of the *cannophori*, or reed-bearers. Paul Baur (Am. Jour. Arch. IX 2: Tityrus) notes the use of Sk. *nadá* = reed as a synonym for *ἀνδρείον αἰδοῖον*, and also points out the connection of the flute, or reed-pipe, with obscene gesticulation. It is possible that the *cannophori*, on March 15, the opening day of the annual festival of this Great Mother of Generation, when the bull was sacrificed in behalf of the fields, carried reeds as symbols of fruitfulness, the custom being descended from remote antiquity. In such a case we should see in *Canna intrat* only a metamorphosed phallic procession.